

spenders are in the Congress, that we can discuss who really wants to spend billions that were not asked for, who wants to spend billions writing in special projects, who wants to start a star wars program.

I also hope maybe we can ask them, "Where are you going to get the money? Who are you going to ask to pay for these, or is this going to be charged to the taxpayers' credit card like so much of the spending is?"

Mr. President, I, if no one else is seeking the floor, ask to be allowed to speak for 5 minutes in morning business on a subject unrelated to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. In 5 minutes, Mr. President—because I suspect at the end of that time some others will want to move on some additional defense issues—I wanted to comment on something that happened during the Senate's recess. About two weeks ago we received notice about America's trade deficit for the first 6 months of this year, and the report was met with a giant yawn because nobody cares much about the trade deficit. Nobody writes about it. The major press does not treat it seriously in this country.

The trade deficit is largely a function of the trade policy that allows big American corporations to profit for their stockholders by accessing cheap labor in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Malaysia, or Indonesia, and selling the products of that cheap labor in Pittsburgh and Fargo and Devils Lake and Denver. All of that might make sense for stockholders and profits, but it means a wholesale exodus of jobs out of this country.

The trade figures showed that in the first 6 months of this year, we have the largest trade deficit in America's history, and that by the end of this year we will have a merchandise trade deficit approaching \$200 billion. Let me say that again. By the end of this year, our merchandise trade deficit will approach \$200 billion. By contrast, the Federal budget deficit will be \$160 billion in this year.

Let me give you some examples of where we are. Japan: At a time when we have a weak dollar, you would expect our trade situation with Japan would be improving. It is not. Japan has a \$65 billion annual trade surplus with the United States; China, over \$30 billion.

We just entered into NAFTA with Mexico and Canada in January of 1994. Prior to that, we had a surplus with Mexico, a \$2 billion trade surplus. Guess what? It is going to be an \$18 billion deficit this year.

I would like just one of those folks, one of those apostles for change, that came here and preached the virtues of the free trade agreement with Mexico, to come and stand in this Chamber and

tell me how this makes sense for America, how it makes sense for American workers, how it makes sense for the people who want good jobs and good income in this country.

We went from a \$2 billion trade surplus with Mexico before NAFTA to an \$18 billion trade deficit projected for 1995. Mexico, China, Japan—our trade strategy is a disaster, one that requires, in my judgment, emergency action in this country to stop the hemorrhaging.

You can make the point—I do not, but you could make the point—on fiscal deficits in this country, that the deficit is money we owe to ourselves, and even though it probably is disproportionately owed you can make the point that it is not a significant deficit. However, the trade deficit must be and will be repaid eventually in this country with a lower standard of living in America.

We have to take emergency action to stop this hemorrhaging. The hemorrhaging is the loss of good jobs moving outside of our country with the enormous trade imbalances.

Some people say, "Well, but the trade deficits relate to the fiscal deficits. If we did not have a fiscal deficit, we would not have trade deficits." The fiscal deficit came down \$280 billion to \$160 billion. The trade policy deficit is going up sharply at exactly the same time.

I would like the company economists to answer that. The fact is, this is a disconnected reality. International corporations, many of them Americans, have devised a strategy by which they say, "We have a plan. Our plan is to maximize profits." We want to maximize profits by producing overseas and selling here. The dilemma with that is it means you are losing good manufacturing jobs, which is the genesis of good jobs and good income and good security in our country, all for the sake of profits. Profits are fine for stockholders. But the fact is, jobs are important for the American wage earner.

We must somehow in some way decide that there is something called free trade, but there is something more important called fair trade. Should we continue to allow producers to decide to produce in countries where they can hire 12-year-old kids to work 12 hours a day and pay them 12 cents an hour and then ship the product to be sold in North Dakota or Wyoming or New York? Should we allow producers to produce in countries where there is no worker safety standard, no child labor standards, no minimum living wage standard, and then ship the product to be sold in Pittsburgh or Wyoming or North Dakota? I do not think so. I think it hurts our country, and I am not a protectionist. I am not someone who believes we ought to build walls around our country. But I believe this country ought to stand up and insist on fair trade and stop the hemorrhaging of trade deficits that injure and weaken America's economic system.

I very much would like one day in some way to see the press and the corporate structures and others in our country, especially Congress, take seriously what I think is an emergency in this country; and that is a failed trade strategy that is a bipartisan failure. It has been a failure for 20 years.

Our trade policies have not essentially changed since the end of the Second World War. During the first 25 years after World War II it was almost totally a foreign policy, foreign aid strategy. In those first 25 years it did not matter because we were so big and so strong that we just won the world economic race by waking up in the morning.

However, in the last 25 years that same trade policy has been a disaster. Sixty percent of the American families now have less income than they did 20 years ago, and less jobs and less opportunities.

That is why this is an important issue that this country must begin to address and begin to address on a bipartisan basis and do it soon.

Mr. President, thank you for the time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 2157

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered this morning by the Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, technically the Senator will have to have someone yield him time at this point.

Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator may need.

Mr. GLENN. I am opposing the amendment. I guess I am ranking on the bill, so I will yield myself time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, to reduce by \$100 million the \$1.2 billion cap on the costs of renovating the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I do not plan to seek a rollcall vote on the amendment, but I do ask that when the vote on this amendment occurs, I be recorded as being opposed to this amendment.

My principal objection to the amendment is its timing.

Mr. President, I support every attempt to make prudent cuts to the cost of this enormous 15-year renovation project, but I believe that lowering the

cap right now is premature. I do not believe it is the intent of the Senator from New Mexico to put in question the need for renovation of the Pentagon. As anyone who has visited the Pentagon recently can attest, the building is in desperate need of renovation.

The Pentagon is over 50 years old. It was built in 1943, and fundamental structural work is necessary. In fact, that portion of the Pentagon closest to the Potomac River has sunk close to 11 inches because the original pilings on which it was constructed were inadequate.

In addition to being old, the Pentagon has received minimal maintenance over the years and its heating, ventilation, electrical, and plumbing systems are breaking down. I am told that the Pentagon averages 30 power outages a day due to the poor condition of the electrical systems.

Moreover, the Pentagon simply was not constructed with the kind of electrical system needed to accommodate the sophisticated electronic and communication systems required today.

Rather, when the Pentagon was built in 1943, at a cost of \$83 million, the Pentagon's office of automation systems today consisted of plain old manual typewriters and telephones. Today, however, the Pentagon relies on 11 major computer centers that form the network of communications, command centers, and administrative support systems on which the Pentagon must rely for day-to-day operations.

As I have indicated, I do not believe there is much doubt that we need to renovate the Pentagon. The question at hand turns on just how much the renovation will cost and what is the best approach to keep those costs down.

We are in the 5th year of renovation. Secretary Perry certified to the Defense Appropriations Committee last year that the remaining 10 years of renovation will not exceed a congressionally imposed cap of \$1.2 billion. That is the effective cap right now.

Moreover, the senior leadership at the Pentagon recognizes that this huge and complex 15-year project needs to be examined to validate the basic requirements of a post-cold-war Pentagon which now houses a much smaller work force.

Secretary Perry established a Pentagon renovation steering committee in March of this year to do exactly that. The steering committee is chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. Its other members include the comptroller, the Assistant Secretaries of Defense for Force Management Policy, Economic Security, and C "cubed" I, the Under Secretaries of the military services and representatives from the Joint Staff. An essential part of the steering committee's charter is to consider cost reduction options for the renovation project.

Let there be no mistake about it. I support every effort to keep the costs

of Pentagon renovation as low as possible. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is designed in part to force a serious and thorough examination of the costs involved in renovation.

I simply disagree with the approach and believe it is premature to impose what is, with all due respect, an arbitrary cut of \$100 million before we have the benefit of the steering committee's recommendations. I discussed this issue with the Deputy Secretary of Defense this morning. He indicated that DOD is opposed to the Bingaman amendment because the steering committee's work is still underway and there is no basis to support a \$100 million cut at this time.

So to the extent that the steering committee's recommendations do not result in at least \$100 million in savings, the effect of the amendment of my colleague will be that necessary renovations will go uncompleted.

Without sounding melodramatic, it is important to remember that the Pentagon is not your average office building. It is our central military command center. Forcing an arbitrary cut of close to 10 percent of current cost estimates could have an unintended disruptive impact on the Pentagon's ability to carry out critical military functions.

We need to ask ourselves some questions: Was the original estimate wrong? We do not know that it was. Was the original cap of \$1.2 billion too high? No, we do not know that it was too high. If so, in what areas was it too high? What programs were overfunded? How much should be cut out? These are things the steering committee should determine. In other words, if this amendment is adopted, what is proposed to be cut in order to achieve \$100 million savings? We have no basis right now on which to say that the \$100 million savings is excess. In fact, I doubt whether this whole project can be completed for the remaining amount that the Secretary of Defense has pledged he will adhere to.

So, Mr. President, I will not seek a rollcall vote on this amendment, but I do wish to be recorded in opposition to the amendment for the reasons I have just outlined.

Mr. President, in December 1994, the Secretary certified to the Defense Appropriations Committee that the 10-year renovation will not exceed \$1.218 billion. I know of no reason now to cut the \$100 million to comply with that requirement of law if this amendment is passed. Therefore, I wish to be recorded in opposition to the Bingaman amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator does not want a vote?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, what I said was I do not require a rollcall vote. If there is a voice vote on this, I wish to be recorded against the amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator just wants to be recorded.

Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? Is all time yielded back?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we will yield back our time. I understand the other side is willing to yield back its time.

Mr. LEVIN. We yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Ohio wished to be recorded on the amendment, and I believe the Senator from Ohio is not in favor of the amendment, if the Chair will put that question again.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair put the question again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the Chair will put the question again.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

So the amendment (No. 2157) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FEATURES PROGRAM

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I rise to describe for my colleagues an important element of the bill that will help preserve our shipbuilding sector and the jobs of skilled mariners. At my urging, the committee authorized \$50 million for the national defense features [NDF] program. I am gratified to report that the Appropriations Committee has since agreed to appropriate \$50 million to jump-start this worthy program. Given its importance to our national security, I thought it would be helpful to expand on the committee's report.

At my urging, the Secretary of Defense earlier this year provided to Congress a study of the costs and benefits of an active Ready Reserve Force [RRF] program employing privately owned commercial ships equipped with national defense features as an alternative to government-owned strategic sealift. Although submitted 14 months late, the report was welcomed by the committee because it confirmed that the program offered important benefits to the Nation.

Unfortunately, the Pentagon's fiscal year 1996 budget request contained \$70 million to purchase existing, foreign-built RO/RO ships for the RRF, but nothing to fund the NDF program. The committee believed the \$70 million requested to purchase these foreign-built and -owned RO/RO ships is not in the national security interest, is not cost-effective, and would weaken our national defense shipbuilding industrial base. Accordingly, the Committee recommended authorizing \$50 million to procure and install national defense features on vessels built in, and documented under the laws of, the United States. This program will provide substantially superior ships, help preserve rapidly dwindling seafaring manpower and skills, save or create a significant number of jobs in the shipbuilding and supplier industrial base, and assist U.S. shipyards in reentering the commercial shipbuilding market.

The DOD report demonstrates that an active RRF program, comprised of newly U.S.-built commercial vehicle carriers equipped with national defense features, would have important benefits. The report finds that procuring these vessels would be a cost-effective means of recapitalizing the aging, lower readiness RRF fleet at the end of the decade. The DOD report noted, however, that securing entry into the commercial market will be a critical element for the success of the program.

As my colleagues may know, the principal car carrying trade is with Japan. Remarkably, only 3 of the 50 vessels operating in it today fly the American flag. In my view, the entry of new U.S.-built commercial car carriers equipped with national defense features in this trade would be in the national interest. Under one proposal now on the drawing board, for example, a fleet of ten refrigerated car carriers would be constructed in the United States to carry vehicles from Japan to the United States and produce and other refrigerated products to Japan at commercially competitive rates. Equipped with hoistable strengthened decks, these vessels would be well-adapted for carrying both heavy equipment and ammunition. Designed to move at speeds and with loading and unloading capabilities that far exceed those of used, foreign-built vessels, a fleet of this size would appear to be large enough to ensure vessels would be available for loading at designated ports of embarkation within the time demands contemplated in an emergency.

I am particularly interested in this type of proposal because it would lead to the construction of new ships in U.S. shipyards. As my colleagues no doubt appreciate, we must do something to help our shipyards supplement their military work with commercial orders. The President of the American Shipbuilding Association, for example, recently pointed out in a letter to members of Congress that "[c]onstruction of military sealift ships is critical to the Nation's defense, to sustaining the Navy's shipbuilding base, and to our in-

dustrial efforts to supplement declining orders with commercial work." By encouraging the entry of new U.S.-built vessels equipped with national defense features in this trade, Congress and the Administration can advance the national interest.

I, therefore, would again urge the Department of Defense and our trade negotiators to emphasize to the Government of Japan the importance of augmenting American participation in this trade as a means of advancing the mutual defense and security interests of our two nations. And I would urge my colleagues not only to support this provision of the bill, but also to support the provision of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations measure that would allocate \$50 million to get this program underway.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1026, the pending bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Is it open to amendment at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can call up an amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 2451

(Purpose: To encourage swift ratification of the START II Treaty and Chemical Weapons Convention)

Mr. LEVIN. I now send to the desk an amendment which is listed and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2451.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION AND START II TREATY RATIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Proliferation of chemical or nuclear weapons materials poses a danger to United States national security, and the threat or use of such materials by terrorists would directly threaten U.S. citizens at home and abroad.

(2) The Chemical Weapons Convention negotiated and signed by President Bush would make it more difficult for would-be proliferators, including terrorists, to acquire or use chemical weapons.

(3) The START II Treaty negotiated and signed by President Bush would help reduce the danger of potential proliferators, including terrorists, acquiring nuclear warheads and materials, and would contribute to U.S.-Russian bilateral efforts to secure and dismantle nuclear warheads.

(4) It is in the national security interest of the United States to take effective steps to make it harder for proliferators or would-be terrorists to obtain chemical or nuclear materials for use in weapons.

(5) The President has urged prompt Senate action on, and advice and consent to ratification of, the START II Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

(6) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has testified to Congress that ratification of both treaties is in the U.S. national interest, and has strongly urged prompt Senate advice and consent to their ratification.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should promptly consider giving its advice and consent to ratification of the START II Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment is a simple and straightforward sense-of-the-Senate amendment. The operative language in the sense of the Senate is that it should promptly consider giving its advice and consent to the ratification of the START II treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Now, these treaties have been before us for some time. There have been lengthy hearings on these treaties, and it is important that they come to the Senate for our consideration.

These treaties are, just very simply, in our national security interest. It will make Americans safer and the world a less dangerous place. They are going to help reduce the threat, not just of attack from another country on the United States and our citizens, but of terrorist attack involving weapons of mass destruction.

First, the START II treaty, the second strategic arms reduction treaty known as START II, was signed by President Bush and Russian President Yeltsin in January 1993. This treaty is a follow on to the START I agreement, which has already been ratified and is being implemented. The START I agreement has led to significant reductions in the number of nuclear warheads that Russia has deployed, warheads that were targeted on the United States but which are now moving to storage and dismantlement as the START I agreement forces retirement of the delivery systems that they were on.

By ratifying START II, we would continue that process and achieve further reductions in the thousands of remaining Russian nuclear warheads. We would further reduce the threat of nuclear war and advance the non-proliferation interest of the United States. By ratifying START II promptly, we could help encourage the Russian federation to also complete ratification.

If START II is ratified, it can be fully implemented, as originally scheduled, by the year 2003, after which the United States will still maintain a robust deterrent of about 3,500 nuclear warheads and the Russians will have about 3,000 nuclear warheads.

START II builds on the progress of START I by restructuring nuclear arsenals away from instability. START II eliminates all land-based missiles with MIRV's, multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles, as well as the last of the land-based heavy ICBM's, the Russian SS-18.

As General Shalikashvili testified for the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and here I am quoting the Chairman:

Eliminating these systems makes both of our nuclear forces more stable deterrents . . . This, beyond even the considerable reductions to our nuclear forces, is the beneficial hallmark of this treaty—a security gain that is as positive for the Russians as it is for the Americans. The other members of the joint chiefs of staff and I have no reservations towards this treaty, about the strategic force reductions it entails, or about our ability to properly verify that the Russians are complying with its provisions. I thus encourage you [General Shalikashvili said] to promptly give your advice and consent to the ratification of the START II Treaty.

Now, that is the advice of our highest military adviser. Promptly ratify the START II Treaty. Mr. President, because START II will get more Russian warheads off of missiles and off of submarines and move them into secure storage and eventual dismantlement, it will greatly consolidate, control and improve the security of those warheads and reduce opportunities for unauthorized access or theft. That is clearly in the national security interest of the United States to have thousands more Russian missiles and warheads retired and dismantled.

Getting that significant reduction in the nuclear forces of both countries will also produce real cost savings for our military over time. The military's enthusiastic support for the START II treaty in testimony before the Congress was underscored by Secretary of Defense Perry, who noted that:

. . . it's very important to lock in the gains that have been made since the ending of the Cold War with formal arrangements, of which START II is a primary example.

Now, relative to chemical weapons, Mr. President, the convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction known as the Chemical Weapons Convention, or the CWC, was signed in January 1993 by President Bush and President Yeltsin after years of negotiations. And there is also strong bipartisan congressional support for this agreement as well.

The Chemical Weapons Convention would establish a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, prohibiting their development, production, possession, acquisition, retention, and transfer. It would require participating states to destroy their chemical arsenals and production facilities under international supervision, an important step toward actual disarmament of chemical weapons stockpiles in those states which possess them. States that refuse to join the convention will be automatically penalized, prohibited from gaining access to dual-use chemicals.

The CWC will make it possible to monitor illegal diversions of materials used to make chemical weapons.

While 159 countries have signed the CWC, 65 must ratify the agreement for

it to enter into force, but only 27 have done so. Most countries are waiting to see what the United States is going to do. Russia has signed the convention but has not yet ratified it, and there have been some reports of continued Russian testing and production of chemical weapons, which is permitted until it is ratified.

If the CWC were in place, it would impose a legally binding obligation on Russia, and other nations that possess chemical weapons, to seize offensive chemical weapons activities and to destroy their chemical weapons stockpiles and production facilities.

Over a year ago, in August 1994, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Shalikashvili, testified as follows:

From a military perspective, the chemical weapons convention is clearly in our national interest. The nonproliferation aspects of the convention will retard the spread of chemical weapons and, in so doing, reduce the probability that U.S. forces may encounter chemical weapons in a regional conflict. Finally—

General Shalikashvili said:

while forgoing the ability to retaliate in kind, the U.S. military retains the wherewithal to deter and defend against a chemical weapons attack.

And he concluded:

I strongly support this convention and respectfully request your consent to ratification.

That is our top-level military official over a year ago urging us to consent to the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

The U.S. intelligence agencies have testified that the Chemical Weapons Convention will provide new and important sources of information to assess the status of chemical weapons stockpiles and production in countries of concern through regular data exchanges in both routine and challenged inspections. The CWC requires declaration by a state of existing chemical weapons, production facilities, development laboratories, test sites and other related facilities, as well as declaration of transfers of chemical weapons and production equipment to others. The CWC is going to improve the ability of the United States to know the nature of the chemical weapons threat so that we can defend against it.

The CWC has a historic verification protocol, and it was, in fact, crafted with the direct help of the chemical industry of the United States, which views the protocol as effective and which testified in support of the convention's ratification.

Mr. President, the Foreign Relations and the Armed Services Committees have both done thorough work on these two treaties since they were submitted a couple of years ago for ratification. Between the committees, there have been no fewer than 18 hearings over the past 2 years, with officials of the State Department, Defense Department, Joint Chiefs, CIA, and other intelligence agencies, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, chemical manu-

facturers and outside experts. So the issues—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Michigan his 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair and yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. The issues, Mr. President, have been fully explored by our committees, and it is time now for the full Senate to consider these treaties and to debate a resolution of ratification. We should not be seen as being the ones to drag our feet, especially if we want Russia and other nations to ratify and begin implementing these important security measures.

We talked a great deal about the threats of proliferation and terrorism which are growing as the cold war thaws and we build a productive, cooperative relationship with our former superpower adversary. But now we have an opportunity through these two treaties to do something to stem proliferation of nuclear and chemical materials, not just to talk about it but to do something to make it harder for terrorists to get their hands on these weapons of mass destruction or the means of their production. And that is why in May of this year General Shalikashvili said that START II would contribute to our counterterrorism efforts and that the chemicals convention would make it more difficult for nonsignatories or terrorists to obtain or create chemical weapons.

I hope that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution will be adopted by voice vote, or otherwise. It simply urges as a sense of the Senate prompt consideration by the Senate of these two agreements.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2451, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2451), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION AND START II TREATY RATIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Proliferation of chemical nuclear weapons materials poses a danger to United

States national security, and the threat or use of such materials by terrorists would directly threaten U.S. citizens at home and abroad.

(2) The Chemical Weapons Convention negotiated and signed by President Bush would make it more difficult for would-be proliferators, including terrorists, to acquire or use chemical weapons, if ratified and fully implemented as signed, by all signatories.

(3) The START II Treaty negotiated and signed by President Bush would help reduce the danger of potential proliferators, including terrorists, acquiring nuclear warheads and materials, and would contribute to U.S.-Russian bilateral efforts to secure and dismantle nuclear warheads, if ratified and fully implemented as signed by both parties.

(4) It is in the national security interest of the United States to take effective steps to make it harder for proliferators or would-be terrorists to obtain chemical or nuclear materials for use in weapons.

(5) The President has urged prompt Senate action on, and advice and consent to ratification of, the STATE II Treaty and the Chemical Weapons Convention.

(6) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has testified to Congress that ratification and full implementation of both treaties by all parties is in the U.S. national interest, and has strongly urged prompt Senate advice and consent to their ratification.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the United States and all other parties to the START II and Chemical Weapons Convention should promptly ratify and fully implement, as negotiated, both treaties.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we accept the amendment as modified, and urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

I state for the RECORD that this amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan has been modified, and in accepting the amendment as modified, it is not the intention of the committee to predetermine the outcome of the Senate debate that will take place on advice and consent to ratification of these two treaties. The committee is merely stating that overall, if the treaties were to be ratified by all parties and fully implemented by all parties, it would be in the national security interests of all the signatories.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not yet reported either the START II nor the Chemical Weapons Convention to the Senate. As a result, a full debate and examination of the treaties on the floor has not taken place. A number of concerns need to be fully aired with regard to ratification and implementation of these treaties when the Senate determines that it is time to provide its advice and consent to ratification.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment. It is important that the Senate promptly take up these treaties. The world is waiting for us to act, and that is the thrust of this amendment. I am glad it has been accepted by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, we yield our time.

Mr. THURMOND. Yes, we also yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 2451), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2440

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment No. 2440 to the DOD authorization bill which has been accepted as part of the managers' package. I want to thank the managers, and in particular, my distinguished senior colleague from Virginia, Senator WARNER, for his effort in clearing that on his side of the aisle.

I will take just a moment, if I may, during the time that no other amendments are pending or about to be offered, to describe the amendment.

I believe that this amendment can play an important role in reshaping and improving the efficiency of our military infrastructure.

We all agree that Congress must continue to maintain the highest degree of military readiness in order to fulfill the constitutional direction to provide for our national security.

But, Mr. President, we need to be much smarter in the way in which we fund the establishment that supports our national defense.

This year's Defense authorization process has shown us, once again, that the forces and weapons we require are rapidly becoming unaffordable.

We have to seek new and innovative ways to conduct our defense business.

We must give visionary and far-reaching tools to the military and civilian leaders in DOD to let them continue to transform and remake a military for the next century.

The recently completed BRAC Commission, the White Commission and numerous GAO and other studies have consistently shown that our military infrastructure is simply too large.

We have completed three exhausting BRAC rounds and have accomplished much—but our work is not yet complete.

Both the 1995 BRAC Report to the President and the recently completed White Commission on Roles and Missions in the Military concluded that further efforts in privatization can achieve significant savings and should be aggressively pursued.

Mr. President, I strongly agree with these conclusions and am firmly convinced that a key element in reshaping our military establishment must be the active exploration of further privatization opportunities for appropriate defense functions.

In the near future, I intend to introduce legislation which will provide the Department of Defense with the tools

it will require to implement the proposals made by the White Commission.

In the meantime, my amendment will give us an opportunity to move forward in exploring privatization opportunities now.

Mr. President, it seems to me that a detailed examination of the operation of our various, non-combat military air fleets offers the quickest and most efficient way to begin the exploration of using private sources to reduce unnecessary infrastructure and associated costs.

We maintain a variety of military aircraft for diverse functions, including: VIP airlift, transport, logistics, aerial refueling, target services, and scientific research.

Several recent studies have reported that, in many cases, these air capabilities exist well above and beyond that required to meet realistic "wartime needs."

In the gulf war, for example, the existing size of the operational support aircraft fleet was 10 times the amount actually used.

My amendment directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive and detailed study to examine "privatizing options" with respect to the specialized, non-combat military air fleets.

I want the DOD to focus on the feasibility of using private sources to replace many of the administrative or support functions now being performed, mostly within the continental United States, by military versions of commercial aircraft models.

The distinguished Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, has highlighted the tremendous potential for the foolish and unnecessary use of OSA aircraft for purposes which could and should have been accomplished, at a much lower cost, using commercial means.

I support his efforts to reduce unneeded capability in this area of military aircraft.

Mr. President, the OSA fleet represents only part of the many functions now being performed by "military" aircraft.

I believe many of these functions can be done cheaper, through private means, while at the same time increasing overall military efficiency.

Paying for air services on a "per flight hour" basis (only when requirements exist that cannot be met by commercial airlines) gives us an opportunity to capture tremendous savings by cutting the personnel, maintenance, and infrastructure required to support these specialized fleets.

Additionally, I believe that the privatization of these functions, (especially with respect to VIP aircraft) will dramatically reduce instances of abuse of the system.

Naturally, we must ensure that we do not inadvertently cut a capability which could adversely affect our ability to conduct wartime or other emergent operations.

We must also maintain the ability to retain training opportunities for the

aircrews who will be required to provide support in "combat operations."

On the other hand, we will never know exactly how much we can cut until we conduct an in-depth study of the "non combat air operations" presently conducted by the military.

My amendment will require examination of the realistic wartime requirements economic assumptions in conducting a cost benefit analysis, and the impact on force structure and personnel which "privatization" would produce.

Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, I intend to introduce legislation which would form a Privatization and Cross-Servicing Commission which will look at options for using private sources in several areas of existing military operations.

This legislation will also examine improving efficiencies by combining like functions within the individual services.

By aggressively pursuing the recommendations made in recent studies, we can save billions in defense dollars without the massive unemployment that creates economic hardship for loyal Federal employees and service personnel.

My amendment can give us many of the answers we in Congress need to craft the tools to further improve efficiency in the military services.

Mr. President, I again thank the managers of this particular bill for accepting this amendment on both sides. I look forward to working with them on this and other amendments as we continue to try to provide ways to meet our defense needs and defense obligations in ways that respect the limited resources of the taxpayers.

With that, Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, prior to the recess I agreed with the distinguished chairman of the committee on an amendment relative to residual value. This is not listed in the unanimous consent because it was an amendment that was cleared on both sides. I will send the amendment to the desk in a moment.

This requires that the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, submit to the congressional defense committees status reports on the results of residual value negotiations between the United States and Germany.

This is a very important issue. It is an important issue for our budget because we are turning over to Germany properties that have great value. There are values that are attributed to these properties on our books. We should get

at least that value when we turn over properties that we have approved to Germany.

What this amendment provides is that the reports that it refers to will include the following information:

(1) The estimated residual value of U.S. capital value and improvements to facilities in Germany that the U.S. has turned over to Germany;

(2) The actual value obtained by the U.S. for each facility or installation turned over to the government of Germany;

(3) The reason(s) for any difference between the estimated and actual value obtained.

A number of us on the committee on both sides of the aisle have been very actively engaged in the residual value issue because of the amount of money that has been invested in these properties in Germany, and this amendment will help us track very carefully what we are agreeing to when we turn over those properties to the Government of Germany.

AMENDMENT NO. 2216

(Purpose: To require the Defense Department to report to the congressional defense committees on residual value negotiations between the United States and Germany)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I believe this amendment has been cleared on the other side and I therefore call up amendment No. 2216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2216.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . RESIDUAL VALUE REPORT.

The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), shall submit to the Congressional defense committees status reports on the results of residual value negotiations between the United States and Germany, within 30 days of the receipt of such reports to the OMB.

The reports shall include the following information:

(1) The estimated residual value of U.S. capital value and improvements to facilities in Germany that the U.S. has turned over to Germany.

(2) The actual value obtained by the U.S. for each facility or installation turned over to the government of Germany.

(3) The reason(s) for any difference between the estimated and actual value obtained.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Congress in recent years has attempted to exercise responsible oversight over negotiations between the U.S. military and foreign governments, primarily Germany, on how much compensation our government will receive for the residual value of improvements we made to military bases we are closing and returning to those governments. In some

cases, there are very valuable facilities we built on those bases, paid for by U.S. taxpayers, that still have some reuse value to the governments to which they are being returned.

For each facility, the Defense Department has determined the remaining value of those improvements, and negotiations ensue with the host government over how much compensation we will actually receive. The vast majority of these facilities are in Germany, which was the front line of efforts to deter Soviet expansion during the cold war.

To show the Germans that we were serious about being fairly compensated for the improvements we made at military facilities on their soil, and to give our own negotiators maximum leverage, Congress has passed a series of measures over the last few years. One of these was section 1432 of Public Law 103-160, which prevented the United States from spending funds to move our embassy from Bonn to Berlin, a high priority for the German Government, until we had recovered at least 50 percent of the remaining residual value from these negotiations. According to State and Defense Department officials, that provision has helped to provide some leverage for our negotiators, although talks have not yet been completed on most of the facilities.

But now that the United States has negotiated a favorable land deal for an embassy in Berlin, the administration argues that section 1432 presents a potential liability that would delay construction of that new embassy and force us to incur costs from that delay. So the administration has requested repeal of section 1432 and the committee has concurred with the repeal provision in this bill.

Mr. President, we need to keep the pressure on the governments we are negotiating with, especially Germany, and also on our own negotiators to recover as much value as possible. Congress needs to continue to oversee that process if we are to maximize the amount we recover.

My amendment continues that oversight by requiring reports from the Secretary of Defense and Office of Management and Budget, explaining the reason for any difference between the estimated residual value of U.S. capital improvements to facilities, and the actual value being obtained in negotiations. If a settlement is providing the United States with less than the full value we invested, we need to know why.

We need at least that level of congressional scrutiny. Our negotiators and the German negotiators should know going into a negotiation that a settlement will be seen and reviewed by Congress.

Mr. President, of course the greatest payoff for our investment in improvements to installations abroad, especially in Europe, has been the peace they helped keep during years of high

East-West tension. But where those improvements that still have value are being returned to the host government, we are entitled to compensation in the form of direct payments or in-kind payments. This amendment should help improve the chances of success in that effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have no objections to this amendment. We believe the American people should have a full accounting of the property that our Armed Forces turn over to Germany and should receive a fair return on 50 years of improvements made to these properties. I congratulate Senator LEVIN on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. THURMOND. We yield our time. Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2216) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LAUTENBERG of New Jersey be added as an original cosponsor to the residual value amendment which we just agreed to, No. 2216.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF BONAIRE HOUSING

Mr. COHEN. I would like to bring to the manager's attention a problem with the disposal of surplus property in Presque Isle, ME, from the former Loring Air Force Base. The designated local reuse authority is having difficulty with the Department of Interior in the disposal of the Federal property known as the BonAire Housing Complex. I understand that it is the intention of the chairman to assist the Maine delegation in resolving this matter.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from Maine is correct. I will be pleased to work to address this issue in an appropriate manner.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the distinguished Chairman for his assistance on this matter.

Mr. LEVIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, per the arrangement that I have made with the manager of the bill, Senator STROM THURMOND, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time that the Senator from Rhode Island be allowed to continue as if in morning business for as much time as he may need, and that following the conclusion of his remarks we return to the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RETIREMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to state that this morning in Providence I announced my decision not to seek reelection to the Senate next year.

This afternoon, I wanted to formally make that decision known to my colleagues, and to share with you all the thoughts I conveyed to my Rhode Island constituents.

This was not an easy decision for me. I regret that it is fashionable today to malign the Congress, to malign the Federal Government, and to malign those of us who serve the public in elective office.

I, however, consider this U.S. Senate a marvelous institution full of talented and committed men and women who, contrary to public belief, are dedicated to serving our constituents and to improving the quality of our national life.

And I continue to believe that government—and the Federal Government in particular—can, should, and does make a positive impact on the lives of most Americans. Federal programs and agencies do not always work perfectly, and many need reform. But they were conceived to help people, and I believe most continue to do so.

When you believe as strongly as I do in the value of good government and see some of its virtues under attack, there is a great temptation to continue to serve and to fight for those values and those programs that we consider vital.

As to my health, I have been assured that there is no medical barrier to my seeking reelection and serving another 6-year term. I feel strong and healthy and continue my 2-mile runs.

However, I decided not to be a candidate for reelection.

There is a natural time for all life's adventures to come to an end, and this period of 36 years would seem to me about the right time for my service in the Senate to end.

I know I will miss more than anything else the people of Rhode Island which it has been my pleasure to serve

these years. They are fine, caring people who put their trust in me all these years, tolerated my eccentricities, and gave me great affection. And I only pray that I repaid their trust and served them faithfully.

And I will particularly miss this wonderful Senate and you, the men and women who serve here. Let me say again, almost without exception, each of us believes he or she can make a positive difference to our Nation's well-being.

This Senate seat from my State has been held for six decades by a forward-thinking Democrat, first by Theodore Francis Green, and then by me. And I want to make it clear today that I am intent on doing all I can to ensure that another progressive Democrat is elected to fill this seat.

And I also plan to do what I can to assist in the reelection of President Clinton, whom I consider a sadly underrated and really quite successful President. He has served our country with intelligence and vision and passion, and I firmly believe he deserves another term.

Beyond that, I have no concrete plans. I will stay active, stay engaged in some kind of public service and will continue to cherish my association with Rhode Island and its wonderful people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be continued for whatever time is necessary for any Senator who wishes to make remarks with regard to the announcement that we have just heard from the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we have just heard the announcement in the typical style of the great Senator from the State of Rhode Island. Certainly, he has left his mark. I will not be here to miss him at the conclusion of his term but others will miss him. The institution of the Senate will miss him because I can say that I know of no one who has been more forthright in demonstrating to his colleagues in the Senate and the folks that he has so ably represented back home in Rhode Island what a U.S. Senator should be, what a U.S. Senator is all about.

CLAIBORNE PELL has been a man of outstanding character, a very hard-working, dedicated soldier for the Senate and for the United States of America and, of course, for Rhode Island.

Certainly, he has distinguished himself in many areas during his term of service. Most distinguished, I suspect, has been the steady hand he has provided as a very senior member of the